



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/840,475   | 04/23/2001  | Michael J. Sullivan  | P-4628-D1-1-C1-1    | 5756<br>13       |
| 24492  | 7590        | 08/04/2003           |                     |                  |
| THE TOP-FLITE GOLF COMPANY<br>425 MEADOW STREET<br>PO BOX 901<br>CHICOPEE, MA 01021-0901 |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  |             |                      | BUTTNER, DAVID J    |                  |
|  |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|  |             | 1712                 |                     |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                        |                 |                 |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Advisory Action</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s)    |
|                        | 09/840,475      | SULLIVAN ET AL. |
|                        | Examiner        | Art Unit        |
|                        | David Buttner   | 1712            |

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-17 and 19-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

DAVID J. BUTTNER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*David Buttner*

Continuation of 2. NOTE: requiring center to be powdered metal or alloy is new issue. Excluding metal or alloy from core layer (ii) is broader than previous claims which excluded all density adjusting fillers. New rejections may be necessitated. No previous claim required hard inner cover, soft plastic urethane outer cover and metal in center.

Argument that Moriyama, Hayashi and Herbert are not combinable is not relevant to the applied rejection. The rejection uses the three in the alternative when combined with Rajagopalan or Sullivan. In other words, the rejection is premised on substituting Moriyama's fillers with the fillers named by Rajagopalan and Sullivan (eg W,Ti). Similarly, it is obvious to substitute Hayashi's fillers with the fillers of Rajagopalan and Sullivan (eg W,Ti). The equivalent rationale is used for substituting for Herbert's fillers.

Even if proposed amdt. was entered, Melvin would still meet many of the claims. Melvin's core has metal (tungsten) in the center and no metal in the outer core (see example 1).

Applicant has not pointed out clear basis in spec for requiring filler(esp metal) in the center and excluding filler (esp metal) from outer core..